

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-15, 24, and 25 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, and 11-15 to further clarify the invention. Applicant also cancels claims 2, 3, 7, and 16-23 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant also adds claims 24 and 25, which are clearly supported throughout the specification *e.g.*, pages 68 and 69 of the specification.

**I. Preliminary Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and for indicating receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 24, 2004 and for indicating acceptance of the drawing figures filed on September 30, 2003.

**II. Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 4-7, 9, 12, 13, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,618,161 B1 to Fresk et al. (hereinafter "Fresk"). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Of these rejected claims, claims 2, 3, 16, 17, and 21-23 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot. Of the remaining rejected claims, only claims 1 and 11 are independent. This response at least initially focuses on these independent claims.

Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “wherein, when the reading operations are to be performed N times based on the instructions and N pieces of the images that have been read are to be printed on a single piece of said medium in respective predetermined positions, said printer unit starts printing, on said medium, the image that has been read before said scanner unit finishes the N times of the reading operations.” That is, a printing apparatus performs N-Up printing of N pieces of images on a single sheet. The printer unit starts printing the image that has already been read before completing reading of all of the N pieces of images.

Fresk, on the other hand, relates to a printer system that includes a scanner having an image reception device configured to flatbed scan a print job including a plurality of pages and output image data corresponding to the pages, a print engine controller coupled with the scanner and configured to receive the print job including the image data corresponding to the pages, and a print engine coupled with the print engine controller and configured to print a plurality of collated copies of the print job (*see* Abstract and col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 16).

Specifically, Fresk discloses an image data corresponding to a plurality of scanned pages that can be sent for one output page when N-Up copying is selected. After all data is sent for one output page, copy processor 10 is configured to send an “end page command” (col. 6, lines 28 to 31). Fresk further discloses that if N-Up or duplex printing is selected by the user, image data from multiple input pages are sent per output page. The copy processor 10, however, sends only one begin page request per output page (col. 6, lines 48 to 56). Furthermore, in Fresk, the processor 32 decides whether more input pages are needed to finish the output page, at step 70.

Responsive to no more pages being needed, the processor 32 proceeds to step S72 and forwards an “end page” command and a “begin page” request to printer 2 (Fig. 7; col. 8, lines 42 to 58).

Fresk, however, only discloses printing page by page such that all images to be printed on a single page are read in first. In Fresk, for example, if four images are to be printed on two sheets of paper, the first and second images to be printed on the first sheet are read, and the two images are printed on the first sheet before the last image (which is to be printed on the second sheet) is read. In other words, Fresk can only start the printing after both images to be printed on a single sheet has been read. Fresk fails to disclose or suggest starting the printing after reading only the first of the two images to be printed on the single sheet. In short, Fresk does not disclose or suggest begin printing on a single page before all images for this single page have been read.

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable and is patentable over Fresk. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4-6, 8, and 9, which are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 11 *inter alia* recites: “wherein, when the reading operations are to be performed N times based on the instructions and N pieces of the images that have been read are to be printed on a single piece of said medium in respective predetermined positions, said printer unit prints, on said single piece of medium, N pieces of the images according to respective corresponding said print modes.” That is, the N pieces of images can be printed according to their respective print modes. For example, these images can be printed on the single sheet according to different print modes.

Fresk, however, only discloses printing page by page such that all images to be printed on a single page are read in first. Fresk does not disclose or even remotely suggests the printing in which the N pieces of images can be printed according to their respective print modes. In other words, Fresk does not disclose or suggest printing different images on a single page according to their respective modes (that may be different from one another). In short, Fresk does not disclose or suggest the images on the same page having their individual printing modes.

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is patentably distinguishable and is patentable over Fresk. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-14, which are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Independent claim 15 *inter alia* recites: “when the reading operations are to be performed N times based on the instructions and N pieces of the images that have been read are to be printed on a single piece of said medium in respective predetermined positions, a first print mode, among said print modes, corresponding to a first said instruction received for a first time among N times of said instructions is stored, and said N pieces of the images are printed according to said first print mode regardless of the print mode corresponding to a second said instruction received for a second time and thereafter.” That is, the first input print mode is used for printing all of the N images, whereas any subsequent modes are disregarded.

Fresk, however, only discloses printing page by page such that all images to be printed on a single page are read in first. Fresk does not disclose or even remotely suggests the printing in which the print mode instructed first is used for printing all N images. In other words, Fresk does not disclose or suggest using only the first selected printing mode for all images. For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is patentably

distinguishable and is patentable over Fresk. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 15.

#### IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fresk in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,375,319 B1 to Kamano et al. (hereinafter “Kamano”), claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fresk and Kamano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,872,035 to Miyake et al. (hereinafter “Miyake”), and claims 12, 13, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fresk in view of Japanese Publication No. 2002/247382 to Fujii (hereinafter “Fujii”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection for at least the following exemplary reasons.

Claims 7 and 18-20 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot. With respect to the remaining rejected claims, claims 4-6, 9, 12, and 13 depend on claim 1 or 11. Applicant has already demonstrated that Fresk does not meet all the requirements of independent claims 1 and 11. Kamano, Miyake, and Fujii do not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Fresk. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claims 1 and 11. Since claims 4-6, 9, 12, and 13 depend on claim 1 or 11, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### V. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 24 and 25. Claim 24 recites: “wherein, when the reading operations are to be performed N times based on the instructions and N pieces of the images that have been read are to be printed on a single- piece of

said medium in respective predetermined positions, a first print mode, among said print modes, corresponding to a first said instruction received for a first time among N times of said instructions is stored, and if the print mode corresponding to a second said instruction received for a second time and thereafter is different from said first print mode, then said second instruction is nullified.” Fresk fails to disclose printing in which the print mode instructed first is used for printing all N images and where the second and subsequent print modes are nullified. Kamano, Miyake, and Fujii do not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Fresk. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 24 is patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Claim 25 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency of claim 24.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 12, 2007